

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 22 and 27 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-39 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13-15, 17-21, 23, 24, 26-28, 30-34, 36, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Calusinski (U.S. Publication 2005/0071342). Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

In regard to claim 1, Calusinski fails to teach or suggest a class structure based data object enhancer configured to generate one or more enhanced classes corresponding to the one or more classes such that an object of the one or more enhanced classes is enhanced to persist data of the data fields to be persisted according to the persistence structure, wherein said data of the data fields to be persisted is data of said object, wherein the generation of each of said one or more enhanced classes comprises adding to the corresponding one of said one or more classes, one or more calls to persist data fields as specified by the persistence structure. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0032], [0059] and [0060] of Calusinski, none of which teach or suggest the specific limitations of claim 1. In paragraphs [0032] and [0059], Calusinski teaches that information about a Java business object can be obtained through the Java reflection API. Obtaining information about a Java business object is not the same as generating a class, much less generating an enhanced class wherein such generation includes adding to a corresponding class, one or more calls to persist data fields as specified by a persistence structure. In paragraph [0060], Calusinski teaches “inferring the persistent data structure” from metadata. Calusinski also gives the example of using a database

management API to obtain descriptions of tables in a database. Inferring persistent data from metadata as described by Calusinski is not the same as generating a class, much less generating an enhanced class wherein such generation includes adding to a corresponding class, one or more calls to persist data fields as specified by a persistence structure. In fact, none of the portions of Calusinski cited by the Examiner (nor any other portion of Calusinski) teach generating a class according to the specific limitations of Applicants' claim. As the Examiner is certainly aware, anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added). Since Calusinski fails to teach generating a class according to the specific limitations of Applicant's claim, Calusinski clearly does not anticipate Applicant's claim.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Remarks similar to those presented above apply to claims 14 and 27.

Claim 10

The Examiner's rejection of claim 10 as anticipated by Calusinski is improper. More specifically, claim 10 is dependent upon claim 9, which was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calusinski in view of Chan. Since the Examiner relied upon a second reference (namely, Chan) to reject the limitations of claim 9, the Examiner clearly has not demonstrated that the Calusinski alone teaches all of the limitations of claim 10. Similar remarks apply to claim 23 (dependent upon 22, which was rejected under § 103) and claim 36 (dependent upon claim 35, which was rejected under § 103).

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 9, 12, 16, 22, 25, 29, 35 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calusinski in view of Chan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,470,494) (hereinafter “Chan”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons given above in regard to the independent claims.

With respect to the § 102 and § 103 rejections, Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-72300/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicant

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 14, 2008